

United States Patent and Trademark Office

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/613,043	07/07/2003	Antero Irri	0101/0022	4699
21395 75	90 04/11/2005		EXAMINER	
LOUIS WOO LAW OFFICE OF LOUIS WOO			TOLAN, EDWARD THOMAS	
	YETTE STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA	, VA 22314		3725	,
			DATE MAILED: 04/11/2005	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/613,043	IRRI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tolan Edward	3725	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre)SS
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and all NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by standard patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a note of the statutory minimum of this riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become All	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this comm BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.
Status	·		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on el	lection. 1-21-2005.		
·— · ·	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice unde			erits is
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-11 and 17-23 is 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 12-16 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and 	are withdrawn from consider	ation.	
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 July 2003</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	a) accepted or b) object the drawing(s) be held in abeyar rection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Sta	age
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· —	Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB. Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7-7-2003</u> .		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-15	i 2)

Application/Control Number: 10/613,043

Art Unit: 3725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sullivan et al. (5,004,399). Sullivan discloses a transfer and manipulating device for workpieces (S) comprising an automated manipulating means (28) to grip workpieces by suction (38), transfer means (12) and positioning means (42). The setting of the workpiece in the positioning means and the regripping of the workpiece is disclosed in column 6, lines 35-49 and column 7, lines 1-14. The positioning and manipulating means are located on the transfer means.

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipted by

Murakami et al. (4,989,444). Murakami discloses a transfer and manipulating device for
workpieces (3) comprising an automated manipulating means (W) to grip workpieces by
suction (30), transfer means (22) and at least two positioning means (53) having heads
(54). The positioning means are provided in separate transfer means (8,9) which
moves the positioning means to a specified position for setting of the workpiece (column
8, lines 30-39 and column 11, lines 60-64). The separate transfer means (8,9) are
moved to a position in order to receive a workpiece from the manipulating means (W) so
that the workpiece is set in a proper orientation for working.

Application/Control Number: 10/613,043

Art Unit: 3725

4

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al. (5,004,399) in view of Caveney (6,769,861). Sullivan does not disclose two positioning means. Caveney teaches two positioning means (11,12). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide Sullivan with more than one positioning means as taught by Caveney in order to define a greater registration surface against which the workpiece is centered.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al (5,004,399) in view of Sartorio (4,806,071). Sullivan does not disclose double blank detection. Sartorio teaches that it is known to position sensors (60,61) to detect a number of blanks that are transferred. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide Sullivan with blank detecting sensors as taught by Sartorio in order to determine if there is more than one blank on the manipulator.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murakami et al. (4,989,444) in view of Sartorio (4,806,071). Murakami does not

Application/Control Number: 10/613,043 Page 4

Art Unit: 3725

disclose double blank detection. Sartorio teaches that it is known to position sensors (60,61) to detect a number of blanks that are transferred. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide Murakami with blank detecting sensors as taught by Sartorio in order to determine if there is more than one blank on the manipulator.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ed Tolan whose telephone number is 571-272-4525.

EDTOLAN PRIMARY EXAMINER